

Testimony of Gregory B. Allard
American Ambulance Service, Inc., Vice President
Association of Connecticut Ambulance Providers, Vice President

Public Safety and Security Committee

Tuesday, March 3, 2015

Senator Larson, Representative Dargan and distinguished members of the Public Safety and Security Committee.

My name is Gregory Allard and my testimony today is in opposition of:

1. *Raised Bill No. 1010, An Act Concerning Supplemental First Responder Licenses.*

This bill, while interesting in theory, would be a major step backwards for our system. Our system has evolved to have structure. Responders must be integrated in the Emergency Medical Services system in order to provide the best possible care for the residents of the State of Connecticut.

Allowing any organization or local interest group that wants to arbitrarily enter into the Connecticut healthcare system by applying for a Supplemental First Responder license, unopposed, would undermine the structure and integration of the existing system. In other words it would bring our structured system back to when it was unregulated in the early 1970s. This was a time where ambulances from different agencies raced to get to an emergency call. It is also a time where responders would get into arguments and physical altercations, on the scene of an emergency, over who would be transporting the patient.

This doesn't mean that our system is perfect; there is always room for improvement. My point here is that "Supplemental First Responder" is not even a defined responder level in Chapter 368d - Emergency Medical Services, Section 19a-175. Yet an application for Supplemental First Responder exists on the Connecticut Department of Public Health Office of Emergency Medical Services website.

Another concern I find in the proposed language is the idea that no letters of support or approval from Primary Service Area Responders (PSAR) or the Chief Elected Official (CEO) of a municipality are required yet later in the proposed language "the coordination and cooperation" between these parties is required. How can you get that coordination and cooperation without the support or approval of the PSAR or the CEO of the municipality? Especially with the passage of Public Act 14-217 last year, municipalities were given greater control over the provision of EMS in their communities. This raised bill would undermine the intent of PA 14-217 by specifically excluding the support or approval of the municipal CEO where the service is to be provided.

With the introduction of Supplemental First Responders as proposed by the raised bill, the rights and obligations of the existing First Responder PSAR are at significant risk of being infringed.

I urge the committee to reflect on my testimony before casting your vote. It has been my intention to sway you to vote in opposition of Raised Bill No. 1010.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory B. Allard